

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

DARLENE C. AMRHEIN, ET AL.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
VS.)	
)	3:12-CV-3707-G (BK)
JERRY RIECHERT, ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER REGARDING MOTION TO PROCEED
IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON APPEAL
(For *pro se* non-PLRA appeals)

Considering the record in this case and the recommendation of the magistrate judge, the court hereby finds and orders:

- () The motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal is GRANTED. 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
- (X) The motions for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal (docket entries 64 and 65) are **DENIED** for the following reasons:
 - () The plaintiff is not a pauper.
 - () The plaintiff has not complied with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) or (a)(2).

- () The plaintiff is barred by “three strikes” from proceeding *in forma pauperis*. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).
- (X) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) and FED. R. APP. P. 24(a)(3), the court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. In support of this finding, the court adopts and incorporates by reference the district court’s order filed on September 13, 2010, which accepted the findings, conclusions and recommendation of the magistrate judge filed on February 17, 2010. See *Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 n.21 (5th Cir. 1997). Based on the above order, this court finds that the appeal presents no legal points of arguable merit and is therefore frivolous. *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983).

Although this appeal is certified as not taken in good faith under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) and FED. R. APP. P. 24(a)(3), the plaintiff may challenge this finding by filing a separate motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal with the Clerk of Court, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, within 30 days of this order.

SO ORDERED.

May 3, 2013.



A. JOE FISH
Senior United States District Judge